



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,986	06/22/2006	Philip Barrowclough	59643.00688	8417
32294 7590 02/17/2010 SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P. 8000 TOWERS CRESCENT DRIVE 14TH FLOOR VIENNA, VA 22182-6212			EXAMINER SIM, YONG H	
			ART UNIT 2629	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/17/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/583,986

**Applicant(s)**

BARROWCLOUGH, PHILIP

**Examiner**

YONG SIM

**Art Unit**

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 37-50.52-60.63-65 and 68-75 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 37-50.52-60.63-65 and 68-75 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11/12/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

At the outset, the Applicants are thanked for the thorough and careful review of the Office Action and the explanation of the inventive concept of the current Application.

With respect to the Applicant's argument regarding 112 rejection of claim 37, the Applicant argues that the specification describes the limitation "non-reflective actuator," specifically citing that silicone rubber is non-reflective of light.

However, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Non-reflective, as one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize, means no light being reflected at all. Examiner respectfully asserts that based on the property of rubber silicone, the reflection may occur. There are various inventions that utilize rubber silicone as a reflective member and the amount of reflection would vary based on the refractive index of the rubber silicone.

Therefore, the argument is moot.

With respect to the Applicant's argument regarding claim 1, the Applicant argues that Nading and Ely fail to teach "wherein the portion of the light guide

surface has a higher refractive index than the portion of the non-reflective actuator surface."

However, Examiner respectfully disagrees. As admitted by the Applicant, Ely teaches a photo-optical switch apparatus which comprises a light absorbing key pad that is arranged adjacent to each intersection to couple light from the channel up into the key pad. The specification describes that each intersection has a refractive index that is equal or higher than the light substrate. Ely further teaches that "a relative loss of light indicates the key being depressed," which means, Ely teaches detecting a relative change of light in the light guide. Thus, it would have been obvious matter of design choice to use an actuator surface that has a lower refractive index than the light guide surface to allow some reflection of the light incident on the actuator surface, which would cause a relative loss of light which can be detected to indicate the key being pressed.

Therefore, the argument is moot and the previous rejections are maintained.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 37, 48 – 49, 55, 65, 71, 73 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s)

contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

According to the Applicant's Remarks dated 6/05/09, the support for the limitation "a non-reflective actuator," can be found in the specification page 3, lines 17 – 22. Upon careful review of the specification, Examiner asserts that the specific reference to said non-reflective actuator is absent from the specification. The specification page 3, lines 17 - 22 recites "Embodiments of the present invention differ from previous implementations in that they use an actuator (e.g. a silicone rubber actuator) in conjunction with the light guide to alter the relative refractive index of the light guide and the substance forming an interface with the light guide thereby altering the reflective properties of the light guide." Examiner acknowledges that the actuator may have a refractive index from the light guide according to the specification, but the specification does not explicitly state that the surface of actuator is non-reflective.

Therefore, for the purpose of art rejection, the "non-reflective actuator surface," will be construed as an actuator surface with a different refractive index.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**3. Claims 37-46, 48, 52- 60, 63-65 and 68 – 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nading et al (U.S Patent # 6,369,800), hereinafter referenced as Nading in view of Ely et al. (US Patent # 4,480,182), hereinafter referenced as Ely.**

Regarding **claim 37**, Nading discloses:

a light guide having a surface to internally reflect a generated light signal from a transmitter [light source 30A, column 3, lines 55-56, and figure 2] to a receiver [optical detector 32A and light guide 20A, column 3, lines 52-54, and figure 2];

and an actuator having a non-reflective actuator surface, said non-reflective actuator surface having at least a portion which is movable between a first position spaced apart from a portion of said light guide surface, with a gas or fluid there between, and a second position which is in contact with the portion of the light guide surface [plunger 16A, column 3, lines 54-61, and figure 2],

wherein the portion of the non-reflective actuator surface has a different refractive index than the gas or fluid, and wherein in use the relative refractive index is changed at a contacted portion of the light guide surface, thereby altering the light signal received by the receiver [plunger 16A has a light reflective material or coating 36, column 3, lines 61-66, and figure 2].

But, Nading does not disclose expressly a non-reflective actuator surface that is deformable and wherein the portion of the light guide surface has a different refractive index than the portion of the actuator surface.

However, Ely teaches a single plane optical membrane switch and keyboard comprising a light conducting channel and a deformable light absorbing plastic sheet with an index or refraction of sheet different than that of the light conducting channel to change the relative index of refraction of the light conducting channel (Ely: Col. 4, lines 25 – 56. Fig. 6. As can be seen in Fig. 6, when the plastic sheet comes in contact with the index of refraction is changed to activate a key.).

Therefore, taking the combined teachings of Nading and Ely, as a whole, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the idea of having a deformable light absorbing plastic sheet and light guide as taught by Ely into the device of Nading to obtain an apparatus comprising a light guide and an actuator having a non-reflective actuator surface wherein the non-reflective actuator surface has a different refractive index than the light guide surface to allow reduction of manufacturing cost by simplifying the button to have a flat surface.

But, Nading and Ely fails to teach wherein the portion of the light guide surface has a higher refractive index than the portion of the actuator surface.

However, at the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to make the light guide more reflective than the light absorbing plastic sheet because Applicant has not disclosed that wherein the portion of the light guide surface has a higher refractive index

than the portion of the actuator surface provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well regardless of the relative reflectivity of the absorbing plastic sheet and the light guide because the system will still detect the presence of the absorbing plastic sheet even if absorbing plastic sheet is not as reflective as the light guide as shown in Ely (Ely: Col. 4, lines 25 – 56).

Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Nading and Ely to obtain the invention as specified in claim 37.

Regarding **claim 38**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 37), in addition, Nading discloses wherein the receiver is configured to output a signal indicative of a position of the contacted portion of the light guide surface [column 3, lines 54-61, and figure 2].

Regarding **claim 39**, Nading and Ely disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 37), in addition, Nading discloses wherein the receiver is configured to use the received signal to control a position of an element [column 3, lines 54-61, and figure 2]. Although Nading does not explicitly teach controlling the position of an element, the examiner takes official notice that it was well known in the art at the time the invention was made to have buttons (keypads) on a cell phone that control the position of a cursor on the display of the cell phone. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide



the keypad using the keys as taught by Nading on a keypad for such a cell phone for the purpose of providing a simple structure to both illuminate the key and determine when a key was been pressed by a user.

Regarding **claim 40**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 37), in addition, Nading discloses wherein the second position is at a selected one of a plurality of portions on the surface of the light guide [column 3, lines 55-62, figure 2].

Regarding **claim 41**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 37), in addition, Ely discloses wherein a plurality of transmitters is provided [See Fig.3].

Regarding **claim 42**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 41), however, Nading fails to explicitly disclose wherein the transmitters are configured to pulse alternatively. The Examiner maintains that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that when the keys are implemented in a keypad as taught by Nading, when two different keys are pressed one after another, such as when someone is typing a text message, the transmitters for each key pulse alternatively because the keys only reflect light back to the receiver when pressed. When the keys are pressed one after another, they light from the transmitter of the first key is pulsed to its respective receiver and then the

transmitter of the second key is pulsed to its respective receiver, hence pulsing alternatively.

Regarding **claim 43**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 37), in addition, Ely discloses wherein a plurality of receivers is provided [See Fig. 3].

Regarding **claim 44**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 37), in addition, Nading discloses wherein the transmitter comprises an light-emitting diode [column 5, lines 24-27].

Regarding **claim 45**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 37), in addition, Nading discloses wherein the receiver comprises a photodiode [optical detector 32A, column 3, lines 53, and figure 2].

Nading does not disclose expressly the optical detector is a photodiode.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement the optical detector using a photodiode because Applicant has not disclosed that using a photodiode provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with any type of optical detector because the optical detector only needs to be able to determine if light is or isn't present.

Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Nading to obtain the invention as specified in claim 45.

Regarding **claim 46**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 37), in addition, Ely discloses wherein four transmitters and a single receiver are provided in a cross configuration having four comers and a center, each one of the transmitters being disposed at one of the comers and the receiver being disposed at the center [See Figs. 1 and 3. The optical channels are construed as transmitters, and the channels are disposed in all comers and a light detectors are disposed at the center of some of the optical channels creating cross figure.].

Regarding **claim 48**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 37).

Nading and Ely do not disclose expressly a hemispherical surface.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to round the edges of the protrusion on the bottom of the plunger 16A because Applicant has not disclosed that having a hemispherical surface provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with the surface shaped as a trapezoid because either type of surface allows for light to be reflected to the receiver to determine if the key has been pressed.

Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Nading to obtain the invention as specified in claim 48.

Regarding **claim 52**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 37), in addition, Nading discloses wherein said actuator has an upper portion in the form of a stick for actuation by a user [top of plunger 16A, figure 2].

Regarding **claim 53**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 37), in addition, Nading discloses wherein said actuator comprises an arcuate disk disposed on said surface of said actuator [top of plunger 16A, figure 2].

Regarding **claim 54**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 37), in addition, Nading discloses wherein the transmitter and the receiver are disposed in a layer on an opposite side of said light guide to said actuator [figure 2].

Regarding **claim 55**, Nading and Ely disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 37), in addition, Nading discloses processor configured to process the signal received by each receiver and output a control signal to control a position of an element [processing device for processing the or each signal received by the or each receiver and outputting a control signal to control the position of the element column 3, lines 54-61, and figure 2]. Although Nading does not explicitly teach controlling the position of an element or using a processor, the examiner takes official notice that it was well known in the art at the time the invention was made to have buttons (keypads) on a

cell phone that control the position of a cursor on the display of the cell phone.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the keypad using the keys as taught by Nading on a keypad for such a cell phone for the purpose of providing a simple structure to both illuminate the key and determine when a key was been pressed by a user. This combination would inherently teach a processor because some type of processor would be necessary to perform the specific function of moving the cursor based on the user pressing the buttons.

Regarding **claim 56**, Nading and Ely disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 37), although Nading does not explicitly teach a display configured to display an element, wherein in use the position of the element on the display is controlled, the examiner takes official notice that it was well known in the art at the time the invention was made to have buttons (keypads) on a cell phone that control the position of a cursor on the display of the cell phone. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the keypad using the keys as taught by Nading on a keypad for such a cell phone for the purpose of providing a simple structure to both illuminate the key and determine when a key was been pressed by a user.

Regarding **claim 57**, Nading and Ely disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 37), however, Nading fails to disclose "wherein said received signal is used to produce a radio signal to control a radio controlled device".

However, the Examiner takes official notice that it was well known to people of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that remote controls for radio control devices (i.e. RC cars) used buttons to control the radio controlled device. Therefore it would have been obvious to use the key or button taught by Nading as the buttons on one of these remotes for the purpose of providing a simple structure to both illuminate the key and determine when a key was been pressed by a user.

Regarding **claim 58**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 37), in addition, Nading discloses wherein the actuator surface is exposed at the exterior of the apparatus [figure 2].

Regarding **claim 59**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 37), in addition, Nading discloses wherein the actuator surface is manually actuable by a user of the apparatus [key 18A is operated by a user, column 3, lines 58-61, and figure 2].

Regarding **claim 60**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 37), in addition, Nading discloses wherein the apparatus comprises a hand held

electronic device (See Fig. 14), however, Nading does not expressly teach that the electronic device is a hand held device.

However, the Examiner takes official notice that it was well known to people of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have an illuminating keys on a handheld mp3 player or a cellular phone. Therefore it would have been obvious to use the key or button taught by Nading as the buttons on one of these handheld devices for the purpose of providing a simple structure to both illuminate the key and determine when a key was been pressed by a user.

Regarding **claim 63**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 37), in addition, Nading discloses wherein the actuator surface is actuatable by a user via a key of the apparatus [key 18, column 3, lines 32-33, and figure 1].

Regarding **claim 64**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 63), in addition, Nading discloses wherein the key comprises part of a keypad [keypad 12, column 3, lines 32-33, and figure 1].

Regarding **claim 65**, Nading discloses;  
reflecting a generated light signal off a surface [light source 30A and plunger 16a, column 3, lines 54-66, figure 2],

wherein a relative refractive index between materials on either side of the surface is changed, thereby altering the reflected light signal, the reflected light signal being received and used to control a position of an element [column 3, lines 54-66, figure 2].

But, Nading does not disclose expressly a non-reflective actuator surface that is deformable.

However, Ely teaches a single plane optical membrane switch and keyboard comprising a light conducting channel and a deformable light absorbing plastic sheet with an index or refraction of sheet different than that of the light conducting channel to change the relative index of reference of the light conducting channel (Ely: Col. 4, lines 25 – 56. Fig. 6. As can be seen in Fig. 6, when the plastic sheet comes in contact with the index of refraction is changed to activate a key.).

Therefore, taking the combined teachings of Nading and Ely, as a whole, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the idea of having a deformable light absorbing plastic sheet and light guide as taught by Ely into the device of Nading to obtain an apparatus comprising a light guide and a deformable actuator having a non-reflective actuator surface wherein the non-reflective actuator surface has a different refractive index than the light guide surface to allow reduction of manufacturing cost by simplifying the button to have a flat surface.

Nading does not explicitly teach controlling the position of an element, the examiner takes official notice that it was well known in the art at the time the invention was made to have buttons (keypads) on a cell phone that control the position of a cursor on the display of the cell phone. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of



ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the keypad using the keys as taught by Nading on a keypad for such a cell phone for the purpose of providing a simple structure to both illuminate the key and determine when a key was been pressed by a user.

But, Nading and Ely fails to teach wherein the portion of the light guide surface has a higher refractive index than the portion of the actuator surface.

However, at the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to make the light guide more reflective than the light absorbing plastic sheet because Applicant has not disclosed that wherein the portion of the light guide surface has a higher refractive index than the portion of the actuator surface provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well regardless of the relative reflectivity of the absorbing plastic sheet and the light guide because the system will still detect the presence of the absorbing plastic sheet even if absorbing plastic sheet is not as reflective as the light guide as shown in Ely (Ely: Col. 4, lines 25 – 56).

Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Nading and Ely to obtain the invention as specified in claim 65.

Regarding **claim 68**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 37), in addition, Nading discloses wherein the actuator comprises a key or button [key 18 & 18A, column 3, lines 32-33, and figure 1 and 2].

Regarding **claim 69**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 37), in addition, Nading discloses wherein said apparatus further comprises a key configured to move said actuator in use [key 18 & 18A, column 3, lines 32-33, and figure 1 and 2].

Regarding **claim 70**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 68), in addition, Nading discloses wherein said apparatus comprises a plurality of keys [keypad 12, column 3, lines 32-33, and figure 1]. Although Nading does not explicitly teach that the keypad has a plurality of keys, the Examiner takes official notice that it would have been well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that a keypad has multiple keys.

Regarding **claim 71**, the limitations of this claim are substantially similar to those found in independent claim 37 and is therefore rejected in a similar manner.

Regarding **claim 72**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 65), in addition, the limitations of this claim are substantially similar to those found in independent claim 38 and it is therefore rejected in a similar manner.

Regarding **claim 73**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 65), in addition, the limitations of this claim are substantially similar to those found in independent claim 55 and it is therefore rejected in a similar manner.

Regarding **claim 74**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 65), in addition, the limitations of this claim are substantially similar to those found in independent claim 56 and it is therefore rejected in a similar manner.

Regarding **claim 75**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 65), in addition, the limitations of this claim are substantially similar to those found in independent claim 65 and it is therefore rejected in a similar manner.

Regarding **claim 76**, Nading and Ely disclose everything as applied above (see claim 65), in addition, the limitations of this claim are substantially similar to those found in independent claim 37 and it is therefore rejected in a similar manner.

4. **Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nading and Ely in view of Ochiai (U.S Patent # 6,196,691), hereinafter referenced as Ochiai.**

Regarding **claim 47**, Nading and Ely disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 37), however, Nading fails to disclose *“wherein the light guide includes an optical grating.”*

In a similar field of endeavor, Ochiai discloses wherein the light guide includes an optical grating [diffraction grating, column 2, line 66 to column 4, line 7].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nading by specifically providing *“wherein the light guide includes an optical grating”*, as taught by Ochiai, for the purpose of obtaining high, uniform brightness even with use of point light sources and reduce power consumption [Ochiai, column 4, lines 1-7].

**5. Claims 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nading and Ely in view of Wingett (U.S Publication # 2002/0061735), hereinafter referenced as Wingett.**

Regarding **claim 49**, Nading discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 37), however, Nading fails to disclose *“wherein said surface of said actuator is supported by one or more side walls.”*

In a similar field of endeavor, Wingett discloses wherein said surface of said actuator is supported by one or more side walls [bridging membrane 27, paragraph 0032, and figure 5].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nading by specifically providing “*wherein said surface of said actuator is supported by one or more side walls*”, as taught by Wingett, for the purpose of resist tilting of the key [Wingett, paragraph 0032].

Regarding **claim 50**, Nading and Wingett disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 49), in addition, Wingett discloses wherein said one or more side walls are deformable bridging membrane 27 can be stretched, paragraph 0032, and figure 5].

### ***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YONG SIM whose telephone number is (571)270-1189.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (Alternate Fridays off) 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on (571) 272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/YONG SIM/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/Amr Awad/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

2/13/2010